REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 5 and 6 are pending in the application. Claims 5 and 6 were rejected. Applicants, by this paper, amend claims 5 and 6. No new matter is added by amendment. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Discussion of Election/Restrictions

The Examiner has restricted the claims to the invention recited in Claims 1-4 or the invention recited in Claims 5 and 6. Applicants elected by telephone conversation with Michael Landry on July 23, 2007, a provisional election without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group II, including Claims 5 and 6. Applicants hereby affirm this election.

Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing certain features recited in the claims. Applicants hereby submit revised drawings which include the features which the Examiner indicated were not previously shown. No new matter has been added by these revisions.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has pointed out that there were two elements of Claim 6 labeled as "h". Applicants have amended Claim 6 to label the second of these elements as "i".

Double Patenting Rejection

The Examiner has rejected Claim 6 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness type double patenting over Claim 2 of U.S. Patent No. 7,251,703. Applicants consent to provide a terminal disclaimer for the current application and thus traverse the Examiner's rejection on the grounds of double patenting upon proper filing of the terminal disclaimer.

Discussion of Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Bennett. Applicants contend that particular elements recited in Claim 6 are not present in Bennett nor are the missing elements presented by any of the other references cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants traverse the Examiner's rejection of Claim 6 as neither being anticipated by Bennett nor obvious over Bennett taken together with any one or more of the other references cited by the Examiner.

The Examiner has indicated that the step of assigning a cycle master (CM) to control the backbone bus is disclosed in Bennett at col. 3, lines 31-40. Applicants note that col. 3, lines 31-40 refers to Figure 3, and discloses a discrete circuitry 30, a logic circuit 32, a discrete driver/receiver 34, a LINK chip 36, a PHY chip 38, and a plurality of 1394 connectors coupled to the PHY chip 38. Applicants note that the disclosure goes on to say that the circuitry 30 is a logic array programmed to recognize the 1394 bus reset and self-ID protocol. The Examiner also points to col. 2, lines 4-15 as disclosing that the CM requests a first bridge device to initiate a bus configuration. Applicants also note that Claim 6 recites that the "CM **requests** a first bridge device to initiate a bus configuration...." In contrast, col. 2, lines 4-15 merely discloses a conventional process in which a bus reset occurs as the consequence of a node being added or removed. While the difference between these two things is subtle, it is substantial and a direct consequence of the difference between the purpose of the claimed invention and what is disclosed by Bennett.

The purpose of the invention claimed in Claim 6 of the present application is to provide a means by which nodes of a first network that are not "bridge aware" can be integrated together with nodes of a second network which are also not "bridge aware" such that the nodes of the first network can communicate with the nodes of the second network in a manner that is similar to the way in which they would communicate were they both in the same network. The problem that is being solved by the invention claimed in Claim 6 is that conventionally a reset would occur, as disclosed by Bennett, when a node is added or removed from the network. However, in the architecture with which the invention of Claim 6 is contemplated to be used, if a first node is a part of a first network which is isolated from a node of a second network by a connecting backbone network (as is the case discussed in the specification of the present application) and either the first and/or second node were not "bridge aware", then the second node would not know when a node in the first network were either added or removed, and likewise, the first node would not know when a node in the second network were added or removed. Therefore, the invention claimed in Claim 6 as amended recites that the "CM **requests** a first bridge device to initiate a bus configuration sequence...."

In contrast, Bennett is solving a completely different problem in a completely different way. The problem that Bennett is concerned about is that of having a 1394 PHY

chip **represent more than one node** in those cases in which such a need arises (see col. 2, lines 28-39). Accordingly, the network that is disclosed by Bennett is all operating in accordance with the principles of a conventional 1394 network and thus a reconfiguration will be triggered by the addition or removal of a node as is recited in Bennett at col. 1, lines 54-59. There is no teaching or suggestion anywhere in Bennett to have a CM that **requests** a reset or reconfiguration of the network, since this is not an issue for Bennett and the problem that is being solved therein. In particular, the Examiner points to col. 2, lines 4-15, which merely state that conventional way in which a 1394 network operates to perform self-ID. It should be noted that it is not the process of performing the self-ID process which is novel in the invention recited in Claim 6, but rather the fact that the process is initiated by the CM **requesting** such rather than by the nodes of the network all individually recognizing the fact that a node has been added or removed from the network. It should also be noted that those skilled in the art will understand that such recognition is an important part of the conventional 1394 network operation and occurs by sensing a change to the voltage on the lines of the network when a node is added or removed. Since the nodes of the first and second network would be isolated from one another by the backbone bus in an architecture in which the invention recited in Claim 6 is contemplated to be used, there would be no way for the first node to sense the addition or deletion of a node from the second network or the second node to sense a change in the first network.

The fact that Bennett neither alone or in combination with any other cited references teaches nor suggests a CM that performs this request would be sufficient to make Claim 6 patentable. However, Claim 6 additionally recites that the CM requests the bridge device to perform the "sequence comprising…transmitting the collection of local self-identification packets to the CM…." While it is true that Bennett discloses a self-identification process, there is nothing in Bennett that teaches or suggests that a bridge device would collect and transmit the local self-identification packets. That is because the nodes that are in the network disclosed by Bennett are all receiving the self-identification packets in the normal course of the network operation. That is, Bennett discloses essentially a conventional 1394 network in which one of the nodes is capable of providing communications over the network for a number of "virtual" nodes. Being a conventional 1394 network, there is no need or suggestion to "collect" and "transmit" self-identification packets. In contrast, the invention recited in Claim 6 provides a means by which a bridge device collects the self-identification

packets for those nodes in the network associated with that bridge and transmits them over the backbone bus. It should be noted that the backbone bus is typically, but need not be, a non-1394 bus. In one embodiment disclosed in the present application, the backbone bus is a MoCA network. Therefore, the collection and transmission is not just a communication over the 1394 serial network whereby each node normally will flow the self-identification packets through to all other nodes. This difference, like the difference between the CM recited in Claim 6 and the circuitry 30 of Bennett, stems from the completely different configuration of the Bennett network architecture and the architecture in which the presently claimed invention is intended to be used. Nonetheless, it should be understood by those skilled in the art that the claims, such as Claim 6, are not intended to be limited to the particular architecture disclosed. Rather, it is the nature of the disclosed architecture that will assist the Examiner in understanding the differences between the claimed invention and that disclosed by Bennett, namely **collecting and transmitting self-identification packets**, and having a CM **request** that the bus configuration sequence be initiated.

Still further, Claim 6 recites "**forming a database** of self-identification packets from all nodes in the network." In the network disclosed by Bennett, there is no **need to form such a database**, since the virtual bus bridge, such as those shown in Figure 4 of Bennett, each are programmed to send self-identification packets as though they came directly from a virtual node through the virtual bus bridge. In contrast, the invention recited in Claim 6 requires that a database be formed in order associate the self-identification packets from within each particular network with the nodes of that network through a bus configuration sequence that the **CM requests** of the bridge device. Accordingly, Claim 6 also provides the element of "the **CM requesting the second bridge device to initiate a bus configuration** wherein the bridge portal become the branch node. The Examiner has identified col. 5, lines 45-60 as disclosing this element in Bennett. However, col. 5, lines 45-60 merely disclose the initiation of a self-identification process which would take place if there is a change to the network configuration. There is nothing in Bennett that would teach or suggest anything other than a conventional method for initiating the self-identification process. Even if it could be argued that Bennett disclosed initiating the bus configuration, the bus configuration process that is disclosed in col. 5, lines 45-60 would be what was already requested in element (c) which recites the CM requests a first bridge device to initiate a bus configuration. There is nothing in Bennett that suggests more than one such bus configuration process

taking place. That is because Bennett does not contemplate having a backbone bus that isolates one network from the others. The point here is not that the architecture of having such a backbone bus is being claimed, but rather that the claimed invention is useful in such an architecture, where Bennett neither contemplates such an architecture nor a solution to the problem of how to get nodes in such isolated networks to communication as though they were all in one network.

For the above reasons and others which are not necessary to articulate herein, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of Claim 6 and request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of Claim 6.

Claim Rejection – 35 USC §103

The Examiner has rejected Claim 5 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett in view of Sato, et al. Applicants note that Claim 5 has several of the same elements that are recited in Claim 6, such as the CM requesting all bridge devices to initiate a bus configuration sequence, the collecting and transmitting of self-identification packets, the forming of a data base of such packets and the initiating by each bridge **another** bus configuration sequence. Accordingly, for the reasons that were clearly laid out above with respect to Claim 6, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of Claim 5. It should be noted that nothing in Sato, et al., or any other cited reference, teaches or suggests the limitations noted above as lacking from Bennett.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art reference, or references when combined, must provide all of the claim limitations and must establish that it would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the references in a way that would successfully result in the claimed invention.

Applicants contend that, in light of the amendments that have been made to the claims as now presented, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established and Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. In particular, Applicants contend that the references, neither alone nor in combination, teach nor suggest all claimed features.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 5 and 6.

<u>CONCLUSION</u>

Applicants believe that all claims pending in the application are allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

This is a response to the Office Action mailed on 7/31/07, and as such, is submitted together with a request for a three month extension of time and the fee required for such a three month extension of time.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of the response, please charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 502165. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to the Deposit Account.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 30, 2008   /Michael W. Landry/
                                                      Michael W. Landry
                                                      Attorney for Applicants
                                                      Registration No. 38,216
                                                      858-229-6801